

## Evaluation sheet – Phase II

### Criteria for evaluation – Phase II

#### 1. (50%) Project proposal value

##### **1.1 (20%) *The ground-breaking nature of the project proposal, the relevance and the potential impact***

- *To what extent the proposed research addresses important challenges (complex/ground-breaking issues);*
- *To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the current state of the art of the research (novel concepts and approaches of development in the field);*
- *To what extent the proposed research involves high risk.*

##### **1.2 (30%) *The scientific quality of the project, including its feasibility.***

- *To what extent is the proposed scientific approach feasible bearing in mind that the proposed research involves high risk;*
- *To what extent the proposed research methodology contributes to achievement of the objectives of the project;*
- *To what extent does the proposal involve the development of novel methodologies;*
- *The effects that the proposed research may produce upon the scientific knowledge ;*
- *To what extent are the proposed timescale and resources necessary, appropriated and adequately justified;*
- *How do you assess the structure of each team involved in the project, the proper functioning of the partnership and which is the degree of complementarity of the teams involved.*

#### 2. (50%) The value of the scientific profile of the Project leader and of team leaders

##### **2.1 (30%) The value of the scientific profile of the Project leader**

##### ***The proven scientific capacity to propose and successfully lead relevant ground-breaking research activities with major scientific impact.***

- *To what extent has the project leader demonstrated the ability to propose and conduct ground-breaking research;*
- *To what extent does the project leader provide evidence of creative independent thinking;*
- *Are the achievements of the project leader acknowledged internationally?*
- *The experience of the project leader to lead projects and large research teams and to train young researchers.*

##### **2.2 (20%) The value of the scientific profile of the team leaders<sup>1</sup>**

##### ***The proven scientific capacity to propose and successfully lead relevant ground-breaking research activities with major scientific impact.***

- *To what extent has the team leader demonstrated the ability to conduct ground-breaking research;*
- *To what extent does the team leader provide evidence of creative independent thinking;*
- *Are the achievements of the team leader acknowledged internationally?*
- *The expertise of the team leader to lead projects and large research teams and to train young researchers.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Each team leader will be evaluated with a score between 1 – 4 points, the final score on this criterion shall be the arithmetical average of the scores received. If one of the team leaders does not obtain minimum. 3 points on this criterion, the entire project will obtain a lower rating.

The final score will be calculated as a sum of the scores for each sub-criterion multiplied to the correspondent percentage and multiplied by 25 (final score max. 100).

**The rating scale:**

1 or 1.5	Non-competitive	The project proposal does not address the criterion or it cannot be assessed due to the lack or incomplete information.
2	Poor	The proposal broadly addresses the criterion but there are serious weaknesses.
2.5	Good	The proposal addresses well the criterion although improvements would be required.
3.5 or 3	Very Good	The project proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.
4	Excellent (Outstanding)	The project proposal successfully addresses all the relevant aspects of the criterion. Any other shortcomings that might appear are minor.

***Caption:***

1. The score will be granted only after having written the comments (correct, complete and solid) in accordance with the significance of every score, as follows:
2. If granted scores of 2.5 or 3 or 3.5, there should be mentioned the necessary improvements.
3. If granted scores of 1 or 1,5 or 2, there should be described clearly the the shortcomings and weaknesses.